

41 (1897) Department.

Date.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 946

Dated 17-11-97

INDEXED.

9/4

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording proceedings,
judt Dept, stating that the existing
arrangements in regard to the pro-
bationary period for Police Inspectors
should continue for the present

T 17/11/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Government (1897) of Madras.

JUDICIAL.

768: 13. 11. 96. ¹³²⁰ 22/9/85
 546: 7. 9. 96.
 382: 18. 6. 96.
 515: 26. 8. 96.
 884: 30. 4. 95. ⁹⁵ 95/11/95
 129: 19. 1. 95.
 1154: 19. 1. 95.
 The Financial Dept. has a special
 note for the Chief Dept. etc.

Recd.

Enclosures

Regd.

20. 10.

1897.

Spare copies

Recd. 11/1/85
 R.O. for papers 2/11/97.
 Note for the CH
 Complete file is subm
 I beg to submit that 80 w 515,
 final dated 26 August 96
 was available only
 today. 12/11/97

G.O., No. 1455, 7th October 1897.

OCTOBER.

ORDER w. 946 of 17 Nov 97.

Min

Recorded

Cmb
 met
 2. 11. 97

Recd. 17/11/97

By a High file of proceedings on the subject of Police Inspectors.

Stating that the existing arrangements in regard to the probationary period for — should continue for the present.

File shown
 to the CH 19/11/97

WITH ORDER

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

G.O., Mis. No. 2128, Revenue, dated 28th April 1897.

Read—again G.O., No. 1416, Revenue, dated 13th March 1897, requesting the Board of Revenue to state whether, in the circumstances stated, it has any objection to allowing a lien for two years on the permanent appointment of B. C. Kamarazu, Probationary Inspector of Police, in the Kistna district.

Read—also the following paper :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 1336, dated 2nd April 1897.

Read—G.O., Mis. No. 1416, Revenue, dated 13th March 1897.

Resolution—Mis. No. 1336, dated 2nd April 1897.

With reference to the Government order read above, the Board considers it generally objectionable in the case of an officer holding a special appointment to grant him a lien for any considerable time as, if, after the expiry of the period of probation, he should be found to be a failure, it would be unfair to the substitutes who have been employed in his place to have to revert. This objection does not apply to the case of the present petitioner, however, who is only a Sub-Inspector, and the Board will not therefore oppose the grant of the concession applied for by him. It considers, however, that two years is an excessively long time during which to keep an officer away from his proper work, and that a year should suffice for the Superintendent of Police to decide whether he should be confirmed or not.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

EDMUND MILLETT,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Order—Mis. No. 2128, Revenue, dated 28th April 1897.

In the circumstances stated by the Board in its proceedings read above, the petitioner's request may be complied with.

2. The petitioner will be referred to the Board of Revenue which has received orders in his case.

3. The Board's Proceedings will be transferred to the Judicial Department for consideration of the question raised in the concluding sentence.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

G. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

" Petitioner (paragraph 2).

" Judicial Department.

From M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 9th June 1897, No. 1992.

With reference to endorsement, No. 1063, dated 17th May 1897, made upon G.O., Mis. No. 2128, Revenue, dated 28th April 1897, raising the question of the length of an inspector's probation in the Police department, I have the honour to say that the difficulty arises from the fact that in some cases, through no fault of their own, probationary inspectors cannot be reported upon for confirmation within the year of their entering the department. It apparently has always been the rule that the date of confirmation should be the date from which an inspector takes his place in the list and obviously the earlier an inspector is confirmed the better chance he has of rising in the list.

2. The regular course through which an inspector passes is as follows: first, instruction in drill office work, &c., for three months at head-quarters; then, training as an inspector's writer for two months; and then lastly, work in a separate division for sixteen months. As I remarked in my letter read in G.O., No. 884, Judicial, dated 30th April 1895, in a large district it is sometimes impossible for a Superintendent to report on an inspector's work within the time required, as report must, under the rules, be based on a personal examination of the inspector. Moreover, in the case of outsiders who enter the department very young it does often take more than a year to properly test an inspector's work. Within the year he will have been only seven months in independent charge of a division, and it is quite possible that no cases may occur in that period of sufficient difficulty to really test the inspector's capacity.

3. I quite agree, however, in the view taken by the Board that it is objectionable that an officer of one department should be kept as long as two years away from his own department with the possibility that he may return at the end of that period, and I would suggest that the following rule, if adopted, might overcome the difficulty. The difficulty, as I have stated above, is this, that if it is made a rule that one class of probationary inspectors shall be confirmed at the end of a year's probation, while another class may be retained for two years on probation, the first class will gain through no merit of its own by obtaining a year's seniority in the list. I would recommend therefore that, while it is ruled that inspectors taken from other departments of the public service shall be confirmed or discharged at the end of one year, the position which an inspector is given in the list shall be according to the date on which he entered the department as a probationary inspector, and not as is now the case according to the date of his confirmation. If this is done, I have no objection to directing that, in the case of all probationary inspectors taken from other departments of the public service, Superintendents shall examine and report upon them for final confirmation within one year from the date of their entertainment in the department. In the case of outsiders who are often very young the two years' probation should, I consider, still be the rule.

Memorandum, No. 1462, Judicial, dated 13th July 1897.

G.O., No. 1154, dated 5th July 1889, lays it down that no probationary inspector shall be confirmed until he has passed the departmental test (which is held about the 1st December of every year) and that all such inspectors should be allowed two chances to pass this examination. If the probationary period of inspectors enlisted from other departments were limited to one year as now proposed, these men would have only one chance of passing the test. Further, if an officer from another department enters the force as an inspector a few days after the examination (say on the 10th December), he has to wait for nearly a year before he can appear for the test and, soon after his examination is over, his term of probation will have expired. But it will be some time before the results of the examination are known, and it is not clear what appointment he should be permitted to hold in the meantime. Should he be reverted to his former appointment or should he be allowed to continue on probation in the Police department until the results are announced?

2. Again, under the existing rules, a probationary inspector has to be kept under training for about six months before he can be placed in charge of a division.

If the period of probation were curtailed to one year, the inspector would have only about six months' divisional work and experience, and it may not, perhaps, be found possible in every instance to gauge accurately the competence of the officer by the work he turns out in so short a period.

3. Before, therefore, passing orders on the foregoing letters, the Government desires that the Inspector-General will favour it with any remarks he may desire to offer on the points referred to above, and state how he proposes to overcome the difficulties therein indicated.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Police.

From M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 21st September 1897, No. 3416.

With reference to memorandum, No. 1462, Judicial, dated 13th July 1897, regarding the probationary period of inspectors in the Police appointed from other departments of the public service, I have the honour to express my regret that I have delayed so long in replying to the reference. I have not replied to it before, because I have so far seen no way out of the difficulty raised by Government. I have been hoping that something would occur to me as a solution, but I can at present see no means of reducing the period of probation below two years owing to the difficulty of the test. This difficulty did not occur to me when I wrote my letter, dated 9th June 1897, No. 1992.

2. The present arrangement under which every probationer is allowed to present himself twice for examination in the departmental test must, I think, be continued. The test is a difficult one and there are several failures at each examination. It is, I think, impossible to insist upon probationers passing it within one year of their entering the Police. If, as I hope in a few years' time may be the case, the present school and court inspector be abolished and sub-inspectors appointed instead, and if the prospects of station-house officers be improved and the Vellore school training made to extend over six months, the Police will not need to indent upon other Government departments to the extent that is now found necessary. The present arrangement, moreover, looks more inconvenient than it practically is, because it is only a very few men who are sent back to their permanent appointments after two years. It is very few men I have sent back at all, and if selection is made carefully at first and only those men appointed who have good recommendations and fairly good educational qualification, there is no reason to suppose that the number of those who have to revert will increase. Out of those that revert many, of course, would go back early in the period of their service. I find that out of forty men taken from other departments I have had to send back only three in three years.

3. I hope, under these circumstances, Government will allow the present arrangement to continue at least until it is seen whether in the next few years any real inconvenience is felt.

ORDER—No. 1455, Judicial, dated 7th October 1897.

In the circumstances stated by the Inspector-General in the last of the foregoing letters, the existing arrangements in regard to the probationary period for inspectors should continue for the present.

(True Extract.)

H. H. H.
for Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Police.
" Revenue Department.
" Financial Department.

Exd. P. Seetharam.

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

1897

READ AGAIN G.O., No.

189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.

B = Not to be copied.

P = Copy abstract only.

Q = Copy heading only.